

# SUPPORT VARIETIES OF NON-RESTRICTED MODULES OVER LIE ALGEBRAS OF REDUCTIVE GROUPS: CORRIGENDA AND ADDENDA

ALEXANDER PREMÉT

J. C. Jantzen informed me that the proof of Lemma 3.2 in my paper [5] is not correct in the case where  $R$  is of type  $\mathbf{C}_l$ . Indeed, the formula for  $e^-(t)$  at the bottom line of P. 242 should read

$$e^-(t) = e_{\tilde{\alpha}} + tN_{\gamma, \tilde{\alpha}}e_{-\beta} + \frac{1}{2}N_{\gamma, \tilde{\alpha}}N_{\gamma, -\beta}t^2e_{-2\epsilon_2}.$$

Then  $\langle e^+(t), e^-(t) \rangle = -t^4$ , and the coefficient at  $t^4$  in the expression for  $b_f(e^+(t), e^-(t))$  becomes  $4a_0^2 - 4 = 0$  (instead of  $4a_0 + 4 = 8$  as stated in [5, P. 243]). So one cannot conclude that  $b_f(e^+(t), e^-(t))$  is a nonzero polynomial for an arbitrary nonzero  $f \in \mathfrak{g}^*$ . In fact, if  $R$  is of type  $\mathbf{C}_l$ , then  $b_f$  vanishes on  $\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E}$  for some nonzero  $f \in \mathfrak{g}^*$  (this was pointed out by H. Kraft and N. Wallach).

The only place where I use Lemma 3.2 is the proof of Proposition 3.3. The purpose of this note is to derive slightly weaker versions of Lemma 3.2 and Proposition 3.3, fill the gap in the proof of the main result of [5] (Theorem 1.1), and eliminate the assumption on  $p$  in the formulation of Theorem 1.1. We adopt the notation of [5].

**Lemma 3.2.** *Suppose that  $G \not\cong \mathrm{SL}(2)$  and  $f \in \mathfrak{g}^* \setminus \{0\}$ . Then  $b_f|_{\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E}} \neq 0$  unless  $G \cong \mathrm{Sp}(2l, K)$  and  $f = \langle e, \cdot \rangle$  for some  $e \in \mathcal{E}$ .*

*Proof.* If  $R \not\cong \mathbf{C}_l$  one argues as in [5]. Now assume that  $p \neq 2$  and  $R \cong \mathbf{C}_l$  where  $l \geq 2$ . Let  $f \in \mathfrak{g}^* \setminus \{0\}$  be such that  $b_f|_{\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E}} = 0$ . It is well known that  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sp}(2l, K)$  is a simple Lie algebra (see, e.g., [2]). Hence the  $(\mathrm{Ad} G)$ -invariant bilinear form  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  is nondegenerate. It follows that  $f = \langle u, \cdot \rangle$  for some  $u \in \mathfrak{g}$ . Let  $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{t} \oplus \mathfrak{n}_+$  where  $\mathfrak{t} = \mathrm{Lie}(T)$  and

$$\mathfrak{n}_+ = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in R_+} K e_{\alpha}.$$

By [1, P. 355],  $\mathfrak{g} = (\mathrm{Ad} G) \cdot \mathfrak{b}$ . So no generality is lost by assuming that  $u \in \mathfrak{b}$ , that is  $u = h + n$  where  $h \in \mathfrak{t}$  and  $n \in \mathfrak{n}_+$ .

Suppose that  $h \neq 0$ . As  $p \neq 2$  the linear space  $\mathfrak{t}$  is spanned by  $h_{2\epsilon_i}$  where  $1 \leq i \leq l$ . Therefore, there exists a long root  $\delta \in R_+$  such that  $\delta(h) \neq 0$ . Put  $v = [u, e_{\delta}]$ . Then  $v \neq 0$  and  $f(e_{\delta}) = \langle h + n, e_{\delta} \rangle \in$

$\langle \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{n}_+ \rangle = 0$ . As  $b_f(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E}) = 0$  one has  $f([e_\delta, e])^2 + 4f(e_\delta)f(e)\langle e_\delta, e \rangle = 0$  for any  $e \in \mathcal{E}$ . This gives

$$\langle v, e \rangle = \langle u, [e_\delta, e] \rangle = 0$$

whenever  $e \in \mathcal{E}$ . As  $\mathcal{E}$  spans  $\mathfrak{g}$  ([5, Lemma 2.3(i)]) we get  $\langle v, \mathfrak{g} \rangle = \mathfrak{o}$  which contradicts the simplicity of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . So  $h = 0$  and  $u \in \mathfrak{n}_+$ .

Thus  $u$  is a nilpotent element of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . As  $p \neq 2$ ,  $u$  has at least one Dynkin torus  $\lambda : \mathbf{G}_m \rightarrow G$  (see [4, Definition 2.4 and Theorem 2.5] and [7, Chapter IV, (2.23)]). Interchanging  $u$  by its  $(\text{Ad } G)$ -conjugate if necessary we may assume that  $\lambda \subset T$ . The torus  $\lambda$  gives  $\mathfrak{g}$  a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded Lie algebra structure

$$\mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathfrak{g}(i),$$

where  $\mathfrak{g}(i)$  is the subspace consisting of all  $x \in \mathfrak{g}$  with  $(\text{Ad } \lambda(t)) \cdot x = t^i x$  for all  $t \in K^*$ . As  $\lambda$  is a Dynkin torus for  $u$  one has  $u \in \mathfrak{g}(2)$  and  $\text{Ker ad } u \subset \bigoplus_{i \geq 0} \mathfrak{g}(i)$ .

Let  $r = \max\{i \in \mathbb{Z} \mid \mathfrak{g}(i) \neq (0)\}$ . It is well known that there exists a parabolic subgroup  $P_-$  of  $G$  with Levi decomposition  $P_- = L \cdot U_-$  such that  $\text{Lie}(U_-) = \bigoplus_{i < 0} \mathfrak{g}(i)$  and  $\text{Lie}(L) = \mathfrak{g}(0)$ . Let  $U_0$  be a maximal unipotent subgroup of  $L$  and  $\mathfrak{u}_0 = \text{Lie}(U_0)$ . Then  $U_0 \cdot U_-$  is a maximal unipotent subgroup of  $G$ , and its Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{u}$  equals  $\mathfrak{u}_0 \oplus \bigoplus_{i < 0} \mathfrak{g}(i)$ . Obviously,  $\mathfrak{g}(r)$  is an ideal of the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{u}$ . As  $\mathfrak{u}$  is nilpotent,  $\mathfrak{g}(r)$  intersects with the centre of  $\mathfrak{u}$ . As  $p \neq 2$ , standard properties of the root system of type  $\mathbf{C}_l$  ensure that the centre of  $\mathfrak{u}$  has dimension 1 and is spanned by a long root element. It follows that the set  $\mathcal{E}_{-r} := \mathfrak{g}(-r) \cap \mathcal{E}$  is nonzero. As  $\mathfrak{g}$  is a simple Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}(-r)$  is an irreducible  $(\text{ad } \mathfrak{g}(0))$ -module. But then the  $(\text{Ad } L)$ -module  $\mathfrak{g}(-r)$  is irreducible whence  $\mathcal{E}_{-r}$  spans  $\mathfrak{g}(-r)$ . As  $(\text{Ker ad } u) \cap \mathfrak{g}(-r) = (0)$  there is  $e_{-r} \in \mathcal{E}_{-r}$  such that  $[u, e_{-r}] \neq 0$ .

Suppose that  $r > 2$ . In this case  $f(\mathfrak{g}(-r)) = \langle u, \mathfrak{g}(-r) \rangle = 0$ , and we derive that

$$b_f(e_{-r}, e) = \langle u, [e_{-r}, e] \rangle^2 = 0$$

for any  $e \in \mathcal{E}$ . In view of [5, Lemma 2.3(i)] this yields  $\langle [u, e_{-r}], \mathfrak{g} \rangle = 0$  contradicting the simplicity of  $\mathfrak{g}$ .

Thus  $r = 2$ . Let  $\mathfrak{g}(-r)'$  denote the subspace of all elements in  $\mathfrak{g}(-r)$  orthogonal to  $u$  with respect to  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ . As  $\mathcal{E}$  is a Zariski closed, conical subset of  $\mathfrak{g}$  (see, e.g., [5, Lemma 2.1]), so is  $\mathcal{E}_{-r}$ . Let  $d = \dim \mathcal{E}_{-r}$ . As  $\mathfrak{g}(-r)'$  is a hyperplane in  $\mathfrak{g}(-r)$  one has  $\dim \mathcal{E}_{-r} \cap \mathfrak{g}(-r)' \geq d - 1$ . If  $d > 1$ , standard algebraic geometry says that  $\mathcal{E}_{-r} \cap \mathfrak{g}(-r)' \neq \{0\}$ . In other words, there exists  $e'_{-r} \in \mathcal{E}_{-r} \setminus \{0\}$  for which  $\langle e'_{-r}, u \rangle = 0$ . But

then arguing as before shows that  $[u, e'_{-r}] \neq 0$  and  $\langle [u, e'_{-r}], \mathfrak{g} \rangle = \mathfrak{o}$ . Since this contradicts the simplicity of  $\mathfrak{g}$  we must have  $d = 1$ .

Since  $\mathcal{E}_{-r}$  is conical each irreducible component of  $\mathcal{E}_{-r}$  is a line invariant under the adjoint action of the connected group  $L$ . So the irreducibility of the  $(\text{Ad } L)$ -module  $\mathfrak{g}(-r)$  implies that  $\dim \mathfrak{g}(-r) = 1$ . As  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  defines a non-degenerate pairing between  $\mathfrak{g}(r)$  and  $\mathfrak{g}(-r)$  the subspace  $\mathfrak{g}(r)$  is one-dimensional as well. From this it is immediate that  $u \in \mathfrak{g}(r)$  belongs to the centre of the Lie algebra of a maximal unipotent subgroup of  $G$ . As  $p \neq 2$  this yields  $u \in \mathcal{E}$  as required.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.3.** *Suppose  $G$  is simple and  $G \not\cong SL(2)$ . Let  $f \in \mathfrak{g}^*$ . If  $G \cong \text{Sp}(2l, K)$  suppose that  $f$  is not of the form  $\langle u, \cdot \rangle$  with  $u \in \mathcal{E}$ . Let  $x$  be a nilpotent element of  $\mathfrak{g}$  such that  $f([x, \mathfrak{g}]) \neq 0$ . Then there exists  $e \in \mathcal{E}$  for which  $f(e) = 0$  and  $f([x, e]) \neq 0$ .*

*Proof.* One argues as in [5, PP. 243, 244] using the weaker version of [5, Lemma 3.2] proved above. The use of that lemma is justified by the present assumption on  $f$ .  $\square$

Let us now proceed to the proof of the main result of [5] (Theorem 1.1). Let  $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}^*$  and let  $M$  be an irreducible  $u(\mathfrak{g}, \xi)$ -module. Let  $z \in \mathcal{N}_p(\mathfrak{g})$  be such that  $\xi([z, \mathfrak{g}]) \neq 0$ . Suppose that  $z \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathfrak{g}}(M)$ .

If  $R$  is not of type  $\mathbf{C}_l$ , where  $l \geq 2$ , the argument in [5, PP. 244–246] goes through. From now on assume that  $p \neq 2$  and  $R \cong \mathbf{C}_l$  where  $l \geq 2$ . Then the bilinear form  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  is nondegenerate so that  $\xi = \langle w, \cdot \rangle$  for some nonzero  $w \in \mathfrak{g}$ . If  $w \notin \mathcal{E}$ , then  $b_{\xi}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E}) \neq 0$  (Lemma 3.2). So one argues as in [5, PP. 244–246]. Thus in order to complete the proof it remains to treat the case where  $w \in \mathcal{E}$ . No generality is lost by assuming that  $w = e_{\tilde{\alpha}}$  (recall that  $\tilde{\alpha} = 2\epsilon_1$ ).

There exists a one-dimensional torus  $h_1(t) \subset T$  such that  $(\text{Ad } h_1(t)) \cdot e_{\delta} = t^{(\delta, \tilde{\alpha})} \cdot e_{\delta}$  for every  $\delta \in R$  and every  $t \in K^*$ . Decompose  $\mathfrak{g}$  into weight spaces relative to  $\text{Ad } h_1(t)$  giving a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -grading

$$\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}(-2) \oplus \mathfrak{g}(-1) \oplus \mathfrak{g}(0) \oplus \mathfrak{g}(1) \oplus \mathfrak{g}(2).$$

It is easy to see that  $\mathfrak{g}(\pm 2) = K e_{\pm \tilde{\alpha}}$ .

Let  $z = \sum_i z_i$  where  $z_i \in \mathfrak{g}(i)$ . As  $\xi([z, \mathfrak{g}]) \neq 0$  one has  $[e_{\tilde{\alpha}}, z] \neq 0$ . Suppose  $z_{-2} = z_{-1} = 0$ . Then  $z$  belongs to the parabolic subalgebra  $\bigoplus_{i \geq 0} \mathfrak{g}(i)$ . Since  $z$  is a nilpotent element of  $\mathfrak{g}$  so is  $z_0$  (this follows from Jacobson's identity [5, (1.1)]). But then  $\text{ad } z_0$  acts trivially on the one-dimensional subspace  $\mathfrak{g}(2)$  yielding  $[z, e_{\tilde{\alpha}}] = 0$ . This contradiction shows that  $z_{-1} \neq 0$  or  $z_{-2} \neq 0$ .

Suppose that  $z_{-2} \neq 0$ . Then  $\xi(z) = \langle e_{\tilde{\alpha}}, z_{-2} \rangle \neq 0$ . As  $z^{[p]} = 0$  the only eigenvalue of  $z$  on  $M$  equals  $\xi(z) \neq 0$ . Let  $\lambda_z$  be a Dynkin torus for

$z$  (see [4, Definition 2.4 and Theorem 2.5]). The subspace  $\text{Lie}(\lambda_z) \subset \mathfrak{g}$  is spanned by a toral element  $H$  satisfying  $[H, z] = 2z$  (recall that an element  $t \in \mathfrak{g}$  is called *toral* if  $t^{[p]} = t$ ). Put  $\mathfrak{a} = K H \oplus K z$ . Clearly,  $\mathfrak{a}$  is a two-dimensional subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}$  and  $K z$  is an ideal of  $\mathfrak{a}$ . But then [3, Lemma 2.9] shows that the  $u(z, \xi)$ -module  $M$  is free (this lemma applies as  $H$  is a toral element, see [3, P. 109] for more detail). Since in this case  $z \notin \mathcal{V}_{\mathfrak{g}}(M)$  ([5, (3.1)]) we must have  $z_{-2} = 0$  and  $z_{-1} \neq 0$ .

Let  $P_1 = L_1 \cdot U_1$  be the parabolic subgroup of  $G$  such that  $\text{Lie}(L_1) = \mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{o})$  and  $\text{Lie}(U_1) = \bigoplus_{i>0} \mathfrak{g}(i)$ . Let  $L'_1$  denote the derived subgroup of  $L_1$  and  $P'_1 = L'_1 \cdot U_1$ . It is well known (and easy to check) that  $L' \cong \text{Sp}(2l-2, K)$  and the  $(\text{Ad } L'_1)$ -module  $\mathfrak{g}(-1)$  is isomorphic to the standard  $\text{Sp}(2l-2, K)$ -module of dimension  $2l-2$ . This means that all nonzero elements of  $\mathfrak{g}(-1)$  form a single  $(\text{Ad } L'_1)$ -orbit. In other words, no generality is lost by assuming that  $z_{-1} = e_\gamma$  where  $\gamma = -(\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2)$ . Given an element  $y = t + \sum_{\alpha \in R} \mu_\alpha e_\alpha$  in  $\mathfrak{g}$ , where  $\mu_\alpha \in K$ , denote

$$\text{Supp}(y) := \{\alpha \in R \mid \mu_\alpha \neq 0\}.$$

The group  $P'_1$  acts trivially on the one-dimensional subspace  $\mathfrak{g}(2)$ . It follows that  $(\text{Ad}^* g) \cdot \xi = \xi$  for each  $g \in P'_1$ . Therefore,  $P'_1$  preserves the ideal  $I_\xi$  of  $U(\mathfrak{g})$  whence acts by automorphisms on the quotient algebra  $u(\mathfrak{g}, \xi) = U(\mathfrak{g})/I_\xi$ . Let  $\tilde{M}$  denote the socle of the left regular  $u(\mathfrak{g}, \xi)$ -module  $u(\mathfrak{g}, \xi)$ , and let  $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\tilde{M})$ . As  $P'_1$  preserves  $\tilde{M}$  the variety  $\mathcal{V}$  is  $(\text{Ad } P'_1)$ -stable (this is immediate from [5, (3.1)]). As  $M$  is isomorphic to a direct summand of  $\tilde{M}$  our assumption on  $z$  (combined with [5, (3.1)]) implies that  $z \in \mathcal{V}$ .

Let

$$R_2^- = \{-2\epsilon_2, \epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2\} \cup \{-\epsilon_2 \pm \epsilon_j \mid 3 \leq j \leq l\}.$$

As  $p \neq 2$  and  $z_{-1} = e_\gamma$ , there exists  $g \in U_1$  such that  $\text{Supp}((\text{Ad } g) \cdot z) \cap R_2^- = \emptyset$ . Since  $\mathcal{V}$  is  $(\text{Ad } U_1)$ -invariant we may (and will) assume that  $\text{Supp}(z)$  does not intersect with  $R_2^-$ .

Let  $h_2(t)$  be the one-dimensional torus of  $L'_1$  such that

$$(\text{Ad } h_2(t)) \cdot e_\delta = t^{\langle \delta, -2\epsilon_2 \rangle} \cdot e_\delta$$

for every  $\delta \in R$  and every  $t \in K^*$ . Since  $\langle \delta, -2\epsilon_2 \rangle \in \{-2, -1, 0\}$  unless  $\delta \in R_2^- \cup \{\gamma\}$ , and  $\langle \gamma, -2\epsilon_2 \rangle = 1$ , we get

$$t^2(\text{Ad } h_2(t)) \cdot z = t^3 e_\gamma + t^2 y_2 + t y_1 + y_0$$

for some  $y_0, y_1, y_2 \in \mathfrak{g}$ . Hence the Zariski closure of the conical set  $(\text{Ad } h_2(t))(K z) \subset \mathfrak{g}$  contains  $e_\gamma$ . As  $\mathcal{V}$  is conical, Zariski closed and  $(\text{Ad } h_2(t))$ -stable we obtain that  $e_\gamma \in \mathcal{V}$ .

Let  $\beta = -(\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2)$ , and let  $\mathfrak{c}$  denote the Lie subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}$  generated by  $e_\beta$  and  $e_\gamma$ . Since  $p \neq 2$ ,  $\mathfrak{c}$  is isomorphic to a three-dimensional

Heisenberg Lie algebra. Since  $\xi(e_{-\tilde{\alpha}}) = \langle e_{\tilde{\alpha}}, e_{-\tilde{\alpha}} \rangle \neq 0$ , the derived subalgebra  $[\mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{c}] = K e_{-\tilde{\alpha}}$  acts invertibly on  $\tilde{M}$ . Applying [3, Lemma 2.9] to all composition factors of the  $\mathfrak{c}$ -module  $\tilde{M}$  shows that  $\tilde{M}$  is free as an  $u(e_\gamma, \xi)$ -module. By [5, (3.1)],  $e_\gamma \notin \mathcal{V}$ . This contradiction fills the gap in the proof of the main result of [5] (Theorem 1.1).

We are now going to generalise Theorem 1.1 to the case where the ground field  $K$  has an arbitrary prime characteristic.

**Theorem 1.1'.** *Let  $G$  be a semisimple and simply connected algebraic group defined over an algebraically closed field  $K$  of characteristic  $p > 0$ , and  $\mathfrak{g} = \text{Lie}(G)$ . Let  $M$  be a nonzero  $\mathfrak{g}$ -module with  $p$ -character  $\chi \in \mathfrak{g}^*$ . Then  $\mathcal{V}_{\mathfrak{g}}(M) \subseteq \mathcal{N}_p(\mathfrak{g}) \cap \mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\chi)$ .*

*Proof.* As in [5] one reduces to the case where  $G$  is simple. In view of Theorem 1.1 we may assume that  $G \not\cong SL(2)$  and that  $p$  is special for  $G$ . So either  $R$  is of type  $\mathbf{B}_l$ ,  $\mathbf{C}_l$ ,  $\mathbf{F}_4$  and  $p = 2$  or  $R$  is of type  $\mathbf{G}_2$  and  $p = 3$ . Observe that [5, Lemma 2.3(i)] is valid for any  $p$  because the  $(\text{Ad } G)$ -module  $\mathfrak{g}$  is always isomorphic to the Weyl module  $V(\tilde{\alpha})$ . By construction, the bilinear form  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow K$  is nonzero and  $(\text{Ad } G)$ -invariant (that is [5, Lemma 2.2(i)] holds in our situation). However,  $\text{Rad} \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  no longer belongs to the centre of  $\mathfrak{g}$  (that is [5, Lemma 2.2(ii)] fails).

Let  $M$  be a nonzero  $\mathfrak{g}$ -module with  $p$ -character  $\chi \in \mathfrak{g}^*$  and  $z \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathfrak{g}}(M)$ . Suppose that  $\chi([z, \mathfrak{g}]) \neq 0$ . Clearly, this implies  $\chi \neq 0$ . First consider the case where  $R$  is not of type  $\mathbf{C}_l$ . Then the roots  $\alpha_{i_0}$  and  $\tilde{\alpha} - \alpha_{i_0}$  are long whence  $[e_{\alpha_{i_0}}, e_{\tilde{\alpha} - \alpha_{i_0}}] = \pm e_{\tilde{\alpha}}$ . As  $\mathcal{E}$  spans  $\mathfrak{g}$  (by [5, Lemma 2.2(i)]) we therefore have  $b_\chi(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E}) \neq 0$ . Repeating verbatim the argument presented in [5, PP. 243, 244] one obtains that there exists  $e \in \mathcal{E}$  such that  $\chi(e) = 0$  and  $\chi([z, e]) \neq 0$ . Lemma 3.4 of [5] holds in all cases as the proof given in [5, P. 244] does not require any assumption on  $p$ . So one can finish the proof of Theorem 1.1' for  $R \not\cong \mathbf{C}_l$  as in [5, P. 245].

Finally, suppose  $R$  is of type  $\mathbf{C}_l$  and  $p = 2$ . Again  $\mathfrak{g} \cong V(\tilde{\alpha})$  as  $(\text{Ad } G)$ -modules whence  $\mathcal{E}$  spans  $\mathfrak{g}$ . So there is  $e' \in \mathcal{E}$  with  $\chi([z, e']) \neq 0$ . Recall that  $e'^{[p]} = 0$ . As  $p = 2$  this yields  $(\text{ad } e')^2 = 0$ . Let  $\mathfrak{c}'$  denote the Lie subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}$  generated by  $e'$  and  $z$ . As  $z^{[p]} = 0$  one has  $(\text{ad } z)^2 = 0$ . Therefore,  $\mathfrak{c}'$  is isomorphic to a three-dimensional Heisenberg Lie algebra. By [5, Lemma 3.4] (which is valid in all cases),  $[z, e']^{[p]} = \langle z, e' \rangle [z, e']$ . It follows that  $[z, e']$  acts invertibly on  $M$  (one should take into account that  $\xi([z, e']) \neq 0$ ). Applying [3, Lemma 2.9] to all composition factors of the  $\mathfrak{c}'$ -module  $M$  now shows that the

$u(z, \chi)$ -module  $M$  is free. Since this contradicts [5, (3.1)] we are done.  $\square$

**Remark.** In [5], I conjectured that for every  $\chi \in \mathfrak{g}^*$  there exists a  $\mathfrak{g}$ -module  $E$  with  $p$ -character  $\chi$  such that  $\mathcal{V}_{\mathfrak{g}}(E) = \mathcal{N}_p(\mathfrak{g}) \cap \mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\chi)$ . This conjecture is proved in [6] under the assumption that the characteristic of the ground field  $K$  is good for  $G$ . The case of bad characteristics remains open.

*Acknowledgements.* I am most thankful to J. C. Jantzen, H. Kraft and N. Wallach for their comments on Lemma 3.2 of my paper [5].

## REFERENCES

- [1] A. BOREL, *Linear algebraic groups* (Benjamin, New York, 1969).
- [2] G.M.D. HOGWEIJ, ‘Almost classical Lie algebras: I, II’, *Indag. Math.* 44 (1982) 441–452, 453–460.
- [3] A. PREMÉT, ‘Irreducible representations of Lie algebras of reductive groups and the Kac–Weisfeiler conjecture’, *Invent. math.* 121 (1995) 79–117.
- [4] A. PREMÉT, ‘An analogue of the Jacobson–Morozov theorem for Lie algebras of reductive groups of good characteristics’, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 347 (1995) 2961–2988.
- [5] A. PREMÉT, ‘Support varieties of non-restricted modules over Lie algebras of reductive groups’, *J. London Math. Soc.* (2) 55 (1997), 236–250.
- [6] A. PREMÉT, ‘Complexity of Lie algebra representations and nilpotent elements of the stabilizers of linear forms’, *Math. Z.* (to appear).
- [7] T. A. SPRINGER and R. STEINBERG, ‘Conjugacy classes’, *Seminar on algebraic groups and related topics*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 131 (Springer, Berlin–Heidelberg–New York, 1970) 167–266.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER, OXFORD ROAD, M13 9PL, UK  
*E-mail address:* sashap@ma.man.ac.uk